

Remarks

Reconsideration and reexamination of the above-identified patent application, as amended, are respectfully requested. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-11, 13-16, and 18-20 are pending in this application upon entry of this Amendment. In this Amendment, the Applicant has amended claims 1-3, 6-8, 11, 13, 15, and 18-19; and cancelled claims 4, 9, 12, and 17. No claims have been added in this Amendment. Of the pending claims, claims 1, 6, 11, and 13 are the only independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Office Action mailed February 16, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st ¶, as containing subject matter which was not reasonably described in the specification. Particularly, the Examiner posited that the specification does not describe the limitation “for each object the identification device or a base module has a respective memory chip containing a code attuned to the object.”

The Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 6 and their respective dependent claims 2 and 7 to address the 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st ¶, rejection. The Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to remove the limitation “for each object the identification device has a respective memory chip containing a code attuned to the object.” Support for the amendments made to claims 1-2 and 6-7 is found on page 3, lines 17-23; page 4, lines 1-6; and page 5, line 20 through page 6, line 7 of the Applicant’s specification. For example, “the identification device includes, for each object, a memory chip containing an encoding attuned to this object” (page 3, lines 17-18); “The at least one object module has the memory chip” (page 3, line 22); “the base module can have one memory chip of its own” (page 4, lines 4-5); “Each receptacle 5, 6 of base module 2 has an interface (not shown), which a memory chip assigned to each object module 3, 4 engages into and makes electrical contact with when object module 3, 4 is inserted into the respective receptacle 5, 6.” (page 5, lines 22-25); “Each memory chip has a respective crypto code stored in it” (page 6, line 3). Thus, in view of the

foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st ¶.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd ¶, as being indefinite. Particularly, the Examiner posited that in claims 1 and 6, the phrase “each object module being assigned to a respective object and each object module having the memory chip with the code attuned to the respective object” is unclear. The Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 6 to address this 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd ¶, rejection. Amended independent claims 1 and 6 recite “each object module being assigned to a respective one of the objects, each object module having a memory chip containing a code attuned to the assigned object.” Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd ¶.

The Examiner rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd ¶, as being indefinite. The Examiner noted that the limitation “the at least two buttons” lacks sufficient antecedent basis. The Applicant has amended claim 19 to address this 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd ¶, rejection. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd ¶.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-16, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0067826 issued to King (“King”). The Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 13 to include a limitation regarding a button provided on each object module. This limitation was generally recited in each of dependent claims 4, 9, and 17 which the Examiner rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as indicated below. Thus, the Applicant believes that amended independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 13 overcome the rejection thereof under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 10, 14-16, and 20 depend from one of amended independent claims 1, 6, and 13 and include the limitations thereof.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 4, 9, and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over King in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,561,331 issued to Suyama et al. (“Suyama”). As indicated above, the Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 13 to generally recite the limitation regarding a button provided on each object module as generally set forth in dependent claims 4, 9, and 17. The Applicant believes that the claimed invention as set forth in amended independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 13 is patentable over any combination of King and Suyama for the reasons set forth below.

1. The Claimed Invention

The claimed invention, as set forth in representative amended independent claim 1, is a keyless authorized access control system. The system includes at least two transceivers with each transceiver being assigned to a respective object. The system further includes an identification device having a base module operable to communicate commands to the transceivers assigned to the objects. The identification device further includes at least two object modules. Each object module is assigned to a respective one of the objects. Each object module has a memory chip containing a code attuned to the assigned object. Each object module is interchangeably connected to the base module through a respective interface. Each object module has a button operable for activating the base module to communicate to the transceiver assigned to the object that is assigned to the object module a command having the code attuned to the assigned object when the object module is connected through the respective interface to the base module.

Amended independent claims 6 and 11 recite the limitation that each object module has “a button operable for activating the base module to communicate to the

transceiver assigned to the object that is assigned to the object module a command having the code attuned to the assigned object when the object module is connected through the respective interface to the base module.”

Amended independent claim 13 recites the limitation that the object module has “a button operable for activating the base module to communicate to the transceiver assigned to the first object a command having the first code when the object module is connected through the interface to the base module.”

2. King and Suyama

The Examiner posited that King does not explicitly disclose wherein each object module has a button operable for activating the identification device to communicate a command with the respective code to the transceiver assigned to the object when the object module is connected to the base module. The Examiner posited that Suyama teaches that each object module (56) (i.e., a remote unit) has a button (82-84) operable for activating the identification device (51) (i.e., an ignition key device) to communicate a command (i.e., lock or unlock function) with the respective code to the transceiver (8a) (i.e., an antenna circuitry of a motor vehicle) assigned to the object (52) (i.e., a motor vehicle) when the object module (56) is connected to the base module (53) (i.e., an ignition key) (col. 5, line 59 to col. 6, line 21; col. 6, lines 58-64; Figs. 1 and 4) in order to control the function of a motor vehicle remotely.

The Examiner further posited that one of ordinary skill recognizes the need to have a remote unit including a plurality of buttons to activate a command function to a motor vehicle when attached to an ignition key of Suyama in a trainable transmitter of King because King suggests it is desired to provide that a transmitter has a plurality of switches to operate a plurality of functions in different security systems (paragraphs 17-18) and Suyama teaches that a remote unit includes a plurality of buttons to activate a command function to a motor vehicle when attached to an ignition key (col. 6, lines 58-64; Figs. 1 and 4) in order to provide

an ignition key device which has a remote unit and ignition key that can be attached and detached from one another. Thus, the Examiner posited that it would have been obvious to have made a remote unit including a plurality of buttons to activate a command function to a motor vehicle when attached to an ignition key of Suyama in a trainable transmitter of King with the motivation for doing so being to provide a convenient configuration of a vehicle transmitter system.

3. The Claimed Invention Compared to King and Suyama

The claimed invention generally differs from any combination of King and Suyama in that in the claimed invention an object module has a button operable for activating a base module (which is operable to communicate commands with the transceivers) to communicate to a transceiver assigned to the object that is assigned to the object module a command having the code attuned to the assigned object when the object module is connected to the base module. As such, the base module communicates the code to the transceiver of the assigned object when the object module is connected to the base module. That is, the base module can communicate commands to the transceiver of the assigned object regardless of whether the object module is connected to the base module, but can only transmit a command having the code attuned to the assigned object when the object module is connected to the base module. Accordingly, in the claimed invention, the base module includes a transmitter for transmitting commands and the object module contains a code which is provided to the transmitter when the object module is connected to the base module in order for the base module to transmit commands having the code.

The remote unit (56) of Suyama is able to communicate codes with commands to a transceiver regardless of whether the ignition key (53) is attached to the remote unit. The ignition key merely contains an energy storage cell (3) for supplying energy to the remote unit in order to enable the remote unit to transmit commands regardless of whether the commands contain codes. That is, the remote unit of Suyama already has the codes which are to be transmitted with the commands and there is no need for the remote unit to be attached to the

ignition key in order to obtain the codes. As such, the relevance of Suyama is the teaching of a typical remote unit having buttons. That is, Suyama does not teach a first remote unit part having a transmitter and a second remote unit part having stored codes in which the two remote unit parts detachably interconnect with one another.

Accordingly, the combination of King and Suyama does not disclose, as claimed, an identification device having a base module and object modules in which the base module is operable for communicating commands, the object modules have codes for the base module to use when communicating commands, and the object modules have buttons for causing the object modules to provide the codes to the base module.

Thus, the Applicant believes that amended independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 13 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over any combination of King and Suyama. Claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 10, 14-16, 18, and 20 depend from one of amended independent claims 1, 6, and 13 and include the limitations therein. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal to the rejection to the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of King and Suyama.

The Examiner rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over King in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,374,164 issued to Eklind et al. ("Eklind"). Claim 19 depends from amended independent claim 13 and includes the limitations thereof. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal to the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In summary, claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-11, 13-16, and 18-20, as amended, meet the substantive requirements for patentability. The case is in appropriate condition for allowance. Accordingly, such action is respectfully requested.

If a telephone or video conference would expedite allowance or resolve any further questions, such a conference is invited at the convenience of the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

VOLKER PRETZLAFF

By

James N. Kallis

Reg. No. 41,102

Attorney for Applicant

Date: February 21, 2005

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351